DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 050 737 LI 002 796

TITLE	[Conference on Bibliographic Control of Library Science Literature, State University of New York at Albany, April 19-20, 1968. Part I: Short Summary of Papers and Proceedings. Part 2: Summary of Recommendations.]
INSTITUTION	State Univ. of New York, Albany.
PUB DATE	68
NOTE	58p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Conferences, *Indexing, Information Science, Information Services, *Library Research, *Library Science, *Library Services, Research
IDENTIFIERS	Bibliographic Control, *Library Science Literature

ABSTRACT

The first section of this report contains a short summary of the papers and proceedings of this Conference which was initiated and directed by the University Library and sponsored by the Library Education Division of the American Library Association. Ten working papers were distributed prior to the Conference and served as a background to the discussions held by the authors and the other major participants during the first two sessions. The final day was devoted to the preparation and discussion of recommendations for improving library and indexing services for the field of library and information science. The second section provides recommended courses of action for the improvement of existing indexing and library services, new ventures, research and development, and leadership. (see also LI 002 797 through 002 807). (AB)

ED050737

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Conference on the Bibliographic Control of Library Science Literature

Part 1: Short Summary of Papers and Proceedings

Part 2: Summary of Recommendations

LI 002 796

State University of New York at Albany
April 19-20, 1968

CONFERENCE ON THE BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL
OF LIBRARY SCIENCE LITERATURE

State University of New York at Albany
April 19-20, 1968

SHORT SUMMARY OF PAPERS AND PROCEEDINGS

CONTENTS

PAGE

I. SHORT SUMMARY OF PAPERS AND COMMENTS

Papers 3

Comments 13

II. SHORT SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

First Session 18

Second Session 25

Third Session 36

Small Group Sessions 42

Final Session 43

CONFERENCE ON THE BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL
OF LIBRARY SCIENCE LITERATURE

State University of New York at Albany
April 19-20, 1968

A SHORT SUMMARY OF THE PAPERS AND PROCEEDINGS

The Conference on the Bibliographic Control of Library Science Literature was held in the Campus Center at the State University of New York at Albany, April 19-20, 1968.

The Conference, initiated and directed by the University Library, SUNYA, sponsored by the American Library Association, Library Education Division, and funded by a grant from The H. W. Wilson Foundation, brought together more than sixty participants from the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom. Among the participants were library school librarians, university librarians, library school faculty, and editors of indexing services.

Ten working papers were prepared, preprinted and distributed prior to the conference. In the first two sessions, the working papers served as a background to the discussions held by the authors and the other major participants: Pauline Atherton, C. David Batty, Joseph Becker, Philip R. D. Corrigan, Michael H. Harris, John P. Herling, Theodore C. Hines, Edward G. Holley, Patricia Knapp, A. Venable Lawson, Gerald J. Lazorick, Robert Lee, Ben-Ami Lipetz, Thompson M. Little, Anne McFarland, Andrew D. Osborn, Jesse Shera, Wesley Simonton, Jane Stevens, and H. Allan Whatley.

In subsequent sessions the discussion was opened to all participants. The final day was devoted to the preparation and discussion of recommendations for improving library and indexing services for the field of library and information science.

The conference was planned and directed by a joint planning committee representing SUNYA (David L. Mitchell, chairman), ALA-LED (Marion R. Taylor) and The H. W. Wilson Foundation (Edwin B. Colburn).

Single copies of most of the papers (in preprinted form) are still available in limited supply. Individual inquiries should be addressed to Mr. Mitchell in Albany. Complete sets of the preprints cannot be supplied.

The full text of the papers and a fuller summary of the proceedings will be edited by Mr. Mitchell and published at a later date.

I. SHORT SUMMARY OF PAPERS AND COMMENTS

A. Papers

Knapp — The Library-Centered Library School, by Patricia B. Knapp, Associate Professor, Department of Library Science, Wayne State University.

Library-centered library education is defined as a teaching method in which library school students find it necessary to use the library as a systematically organized body of resources, i.e., to find materials not assigned or recommended by their instructors. It is justified on the grounds that the professional should have mastered the literature of the field. The literature of librarianship is classified as: 1) the literature related to the practice of librarianship, including the organizational and functional context in which it is practiced; 2) the "body of knowledge" upon which librarianship is based, which has not yet been clearly defined; and 3) the literature librarians deal with, i.e. everything. Assignments in technical services and in academic librarianship are offered as examples of work with the organization of the literature of library practice; assignments in subject reference and bibliography in the social sciences and in the humanities illustrate work with the organization of the literatures librarians deal with. (PBK)

Lee — The Special Collection in Librarianship, by Robert Lee, Chairman, Department of Librarianship, Kansas State Teachers College.

Recommends guidelines for the development of a special collection of materials to support a master's program in librarianship. Emphasis is on the reasons for establishing a separate library school library and on the factors to consider in the initial and continuing development of the library school collections.

Includes discussion of the objectives and functions of the library school library; specific guidelines concerning the intent and extent of the collection to support a master's program; the library school library's laboratory collections; selection policy and procedures for the library school collection; and the qualifications and functions of the library school librarian.

Lee (cont'd)

Survey of ALA accredited library schools: 33 schools maintain a separate collection of materials in the area of library science, 9 schools do not have separate library school libraries; in 18 institutions the library science collection is administered by the library school and in 23 institutions the collection is administered by the university library; in 32 institutions the library science collection is under the direction of a full-time librarian and 10 institutions have a part-time librarian; 34 directors of library schools believe that it is desirable to maintain a separate collection of materials in the area of library science, while 6 think that it is not desirable, one thinks that is doubtful, one is undecided and one -- no answer. (RL)

Little

The Use and Users of Library Literature, by Thompson M. Little, Associate Director of Library Services, Hofstra University Library.

The author first attempts to assess the present state of library literature -- what is being produced, what has characterized its development, and what have we as librarians thought about our professional literature? The phenomenal growth of library literature is noted: 63.75% of all the library oriented periodicals in existence today began publication after 1946. A review of the pertinent literature shows that the profession has expressed little concern with the quality, content and effectiveness of library literature. The profession has reached a point where it must examine in minute detail the information needs of its members and the channels by which these needs are fulfilled.

A detailed investigation of users was beyond the scope of this paper. A citation analysis was made to identify those elements of library literature used by library authors. Previous citation studies were reviewed and correlated with the present study of 50 source items (monographs, periodicals and syllabi). A

Little (cont'd)

total of 12,034 citations were reviewed. Analysis revealed (1) a low utilization of journals when compared to the volume of periodical literature; (2) a relatively low utilization of literature outside the field; and (3) a high concentration of citations to a small number of journals. (TML)

Harris — Fugitive Literature in Library Science: American Library History as a Test Case, by Michael H. Harris, doctoral candidate, Graduate Library School, Indiana University.

Begins with a discussion of the interdisciplinary nature of the literature of American library history, and indicates that much of the best literature in the field is published in journals which do not fit within the familiar confines of "library literature." To illustrate the bibliographic difficulties faced by the researcher in American library history, a bibliography of 170 items relating to Pennsylvania library history was checked against: (1) Library Literature; (2) Writings on American History; and (3) America: History and Life. The use of all three tools produced only 93 of the 170 entries in the bibliography. The author goes on to suggest a number of remedies for this lack of bibliographic coverage, which include: (1) broadening the coverage of Library Literature; (2) publication of an annual review of the literature of American library history; and (3) the preparation of a comprehensive bibliography of American library history. The author concludes by observing that the absence of these essential tools has hindered collection building in the field of American library history and has led to considerable duplication of research. (MHH)

McFarland — Problems in the Awareness and Acquisition of the Monographic Literature of Library Science, by Anne McFarland, Librarian, School of Library Science, Case Western Reserve University.

The scope of the paper includes awareness and acquisition of current monographic literature pertinent to the philosophy and techniques of library and information science. There are three major difficulties in noting the existence of new

McFarland (cont'd)

literature in library science. First, there is no central source for the awareness of this literature. Second, very few reviews appear, and the same books often receive a large number of the reviews. Third, with reference to English-language materials alone, many items of importance do not qualify for listing in CBI, BPR, etc., because they contain fewer than 49 pages or because publication is informal. There are nine major means of awareness of new material: the professional journals; the indexing and abstracting services; the trade and national bibliographies; LC proof sheets (class Z); special bibliographies contributed by those in the field; promotional literature; gift; word-of-mouth; and exchange of acquisition lists. A comprehensive awareness service, drawing from all these sources, would: include full citations of publisher, date, and price; adhere to international standards relating to the forms of bibliographical citation; and provide regular subject indexing. One of the existing abstracting and indexing journals could be the best suited to include such listings (in a separate section for ease of use), but a more attractive solution would derive from a separate current bibliography of library science.

Four major problems arise in attempts to collect the literature of library science: very few of the items are available through trade channels; there is often great difficulty in securing a response from the agency addressed; there is the problem of handling small sums of money for payment; and many items noted and even reviewed are not given adequate citations. A practical improvement in this situation could be effected by the expansion of library school library acquisition lists. Citations could be expanded to include source data on the more obscure publications. A bibliography compiled from these lists would provide as comprehensive as possible a bibliography of literature pertinent to library science and would reflect librarianship as it is taught and practiced in the United States today. Nearly all English-language publications would be included regardless of length. Since the different schools have specific strengths of curriculum, the different areas of librarianship would be well-represented. If adequate cooperation from all major library science collections could be insured, a computer-produced bibliography might be the most feasable

McFarland (cont'd)

alternative since such production would facilitate subject indexing and cumulation. Such a bibliography would be of use not only to those engaged in building library science collections but would serve the entire profession. (AM)

Corrigan

A Model System for the Bibliographic Organization of Library Science Literature, by Philip R. D. Corrigan, Tutor/Librarian, College of Librarianship, Wales*

The first section establishes a working definition of library science and outlines the existing publications patterns of library science information. The existing system of bibliographic organization is examined in some detail, with reference to previous research. Detail is given of the services provided in the U.S.S.R., to provide an example of a systematic attempt at world coverage. The situation in late 1967 reflects a diversity of effort producing an unsatisfactory result: there is no one service (or group of related services) to which one can turn to receive reliable coverage of current information. Next, the existing literature on the attitudes of the user of library science information is reviewed together with literature on more general aspects concerning the publications covering library science.

The second section, entitled: "What then is to be done--steps toward a model scheme," is mainly concerned with the needs of the English language bloc. To avoid the imposition of services by individuals or small groups, the first recommendation suggests the establishment of an International Study Group which will be charged with an oversight of library science information problems. The International Study Group should have three tasks, carried out within each country and co-ordinated by the main committee. 1) Survey of information needs, producing a user profile; 2) Survey of information patterns, producing an information profile; 3) Comparison of user and information profiles leading to the construction of a master scheme of information services for the English language bloc, such a scheme to cover primary as well as secondary service.

*Presently, Lecturer in Information Science and Course Tutor (Librarianship), West London College.

Osborn (cont'd)

A highly selective, complementary computer service would serve the research needs of the profession and would create a model for similar service in other fields. Its intellectual organization should be developed with a mathematical base into which various relational elements could be built. The scheme developed for the book catalog of the library school library, University of Western Ontario, indicates the possibilities in this new type of control. There are prospects for a cooperative service with library schools sharing the selective listing task and exchanging computer tapes. (DLM)

Hines — Vocabulary Control in Indexing the Literature of Librarianship and Information Science, by Theodore C. Hines, Associate Professor, School of Library Service, Columbia University.

All types of vocabulary control problems occur in indexing the literature of librarianship. As background to the study of the indexing requirements of the field, this paper proposes to indicate issues, clear up misunderstandings, advance some tentative conclusions, and suggest further exploration and research.

There are three elements in vocabulary control: 1) control over concepts selected (the "depth" of indexing), 2) control over the form of expression of concepts in the index, and 3) control of the syndetic apparatus of the index. Topics discussed include: context in which vocabulary terms appear, subject and aspect, subject and class entry, other types of entries (author, title, series, etc.), depth of indexing, citation and keyword indexing, centralized and decentralized indexing, subject lists and thesauri, subject headings and classification.

Current indexing research has largely ignored the codified record of past indexing experience. The library experience in subject heading work is the most carefully codified and tested over a longer period of time, but has been ignored because it is primarily used for a relatively shallow form of indexing. The author draws from this experience to formulate ten general guidelines to be considered in planning the indexing services for a professional literature.

Hines (cont'd)

In library and information science the major vocabulary problems are the speed of introduction of new terms, the nature of class headings, and the uncertain terminology of the field. Library Literature is the only substantial index with an established, conparatively sophisticated vocabulary control; and it maintains the only list of headings used for substantial amounts of literature in the field. The author proposes aid to Library Literature for exploring new production methods, for research, and for expanding the staff, depth, and scope of the index (through subsidy if necessary) to produce a model index, "Library and Information Science Literature." (DLM)

Richmond & Atherton

Subject Analysis of Library Science Literature by Means of Classification Systems: Outline of Criteria Needed for Evaluation, by Phyllis Richmond, Information Systems Specialist, University of Rochester Library; and Pauline Atherton, Associate Professor, School of Library Science, Syracuse University.

An outline is presented for the study of the effect of classification on the various methods of bibliographic control applied to library science literature. Aside from the examples of classification schemes, which are drawn from the subject area of library science, the outline is a general guide to the evaluation of classification systems in any subject field. Three major sets of factors are involved: evaluation of the system according to 1) purpose, 2) design, and 3) functional operation.

In considering the question, "Why was this classification made?" (purpose), the authors identify eight types of classification. For the question, "How is this classification made?" (design), three kinds of analysis are proposed: 1) according to Ranganathan's canons, 2) in relation to the stated or derivable philosophy governing a system, and 3) in relation to the "helpfulness or hindrance" qualities of a scheme's collateral features, such as notation, format, dimensions, auxiliary schedules or similar addenda. For the third question, "How well does this classification do what it was made to do?" (functional operation), the authors propose study of a system's performance in terms of its stated

Richmond & Atherton (cont'd)

purpose, its adaptability in relation to different kinds of need and to mechanization, and in reference to the possibility of demonstrating the demands on a classification by various types of users.

Topics for further research are mentioned. The literature of library science is manageable to work with and contains most of the types of classification systems. It is a good base for sound studies whose results could be applied to the study of classification in other fields and generally. (DLM)

14

B. Comments*

Mrs. Knapp's paper grows out of her very rich and very fruitful experience as librarian of Monteith College at Wayne State. The Monteith experiment was one of the most original, and one of the most provocative and stimulating things to come out of academic librarianship. She is now reinterpreting this Monteith experience in terms of a library school. The materials which library schools are using--the boundaries of those materials--are becoming greater and greater, extending over a wider and wider area. The problem of finding what is the proper province of the library school library as against the total collections of the university becomes extremely difficult as our education program in library schools becomes increasingly interdisciplinary. In a situation like this, the point of isolating a library specifically for the library school begins to break down. If we say that an educational program should be library-centered, it ought to be in the library school that this concept is given its strongest enunciation. In this paper, we have an excellent philosophical backdrop for discussion.

*Since the conference was not designed to subject the papers to detailed criticism and analysis but to supply the participants with a common fund of information and suggestion, the general discussions were not intended to provide direct comment on the papers. We have gathered here a summary of what little direct comment did occur and an occasional comment on the role played by the papers in the sessions.

Mr. Lee's paper, very well and very carefully developed, is perhaps more relevant for the Committee on Accreditation than it is for this group. The Committee on Accreditation should welcome this statement very much, because it gives us a foundation and a yardstick for evaluating the kind of bibliographic resources that a library school should have. But these are primarily administrative problems that are not central to the problems we should be discussing here. Whether or not you have a separate library school library depends not only on your philosophy of what it should be but also on the situation on your own campus.

Mr. Little's paper raises the question: "do we really know what our needs are?" He demonstrates that the utilization of our own narrowly-defined literature is high, that the use of periodical literature is concentrated in some twenty journals, and that the problems in our field are not unique. He points out that the quality of the literature is said to be not good (a judgment in which the reactor did not, "in historical perspective," concur). One hopes that this paper will lead to further investigation of the type of librarian who uses these materials. The issues raised in this paper came in for considerable discussion throughout the conference sessions. The author's suggestion, that the library profession look to the American Psychological Association's project on information exchange as a possible model, was often alluded to and finally incorporated into the conference recommendations.

Mr. Harris' paper underlines one of the major problems of the field--its interdisciplinary nature as compared to the relatively parochial coverage of its bibliographic tools. A comprehensive retrospective bibliography for American library history, as proposed in the paper, would be welcomed more enthusiastically by library historians than would any kind of current awareness service. It would also be more difficult to achieve. A start in this direction is being made however. Dr. Zachert at The Journal of Library of Library History is quite interested in such a project. At present, retrospective bibliographies of library history in a number of individual states have been prepared, or are being planned, for Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Georgia, Florida, Texas, Arizona, New Mexico and Oklahoma. Anyone interested in cooperating in this project, by working on one of the other states, should write to Dr. Zachert. Also, the first annual review of the literature on American Library history, prepared by Mr. Harris, will appear in the October 1968 issue of JLH.

Mrs. McFarland's paper singled out another major problem in controlling the literature of library and information science--the fragmentation and inadequacy of current bibliographic sources. This not only impedes the acquisition of materials by library school libraries but also the compilation of annual review and current state-of-the-art publications. Not only is there no central source for awareness but the

existing services, with their present staffing and support, cannot handle the amount of material that now comes to their attention. There is uncertainty as to what--in round figures--is the extent of the literature in question. These matters were discussed at some length in the conference sessions.

Mr. Corrigan's survey of the existing situation, and his statement of proposals for an integrated and expanded trio of services, provided the common background for discussion during the conference. Although his proposals were specifically focused on the improvement of services for the "English-language bloc," he placed considerable emphasis on the international organization of access to the whole literature of library and information science. This latter emphasis was occasionally lost sight of. Much of the subsequent discussion during the conference--and some of the final recommendations--seemed to center exclusively on the requirements and responsibilities of the profession in the United States.

Mr. Herling and Mr. Lazorick's paper, although it was implicitly considered in the running debate about "current awareness" services, did not come in for specific comment during the conference sessions. The authors felt that with a little encouragement they could produce a useful service.

Some participants agreed (e.g., one of the small working groups that met Saturday morning). However, encouragement of a general nature was not forthcoming from the conference as a whole, because the proposal was never directly considered in the larger sessions. It is assumed that the proposal is still open to the profession for consideration.

The most discussed aspect of Mr. Osborn's paper was his proposal for format changes in Library Literature. The conference chose to give first priority to this more immediate question rather than inquire into the author's more generalized plea for a new kind of classification on "relational" principles as a means to more sophisticated and selective access.

Mr. Hines' paper provides the criteria for judging which techniques, or combination of techniques, would actually best serve our purposes. However, the feeling was that it was premature to make that judgment, because we have not decided yet what it is we want to do. When we do decide, this paper will be important to us as a foundation on which to make the decisions we will have to make with respect to classification and organization.

Mrs. Richmond and Mrs. Atherton's paper did not bring forth specific comment or discussion during the conference sessions for much the same reason as in the case of the preceding paper. The further usefulness of this paper will lie in the classification research it may help to initiate, using the subject area of library and information science as a case study.

II. SHORT SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

A. First Session (April 19, 9:30 AM)

After the remarks of the commentators, who reacted to the first group of papers (see Part I above), the discussion was opened to all the major participants.

The moderator declared off-limits the discussion of both "the curriculum of library schools" and "terminology." She suggested that the first topic be the question of book reviewing since that had been the subject of some criticism in a number of the papers and since the matter of its improvement was one "we can do something about." Although this choice of subject moved the group's attention away from the session's announced topic of "Library Services," it provided a good forum for uncovering the important issues that everyone seemed to want to talk about first: the identity of the users within the field, the nature of their needs, and the shape of the field itself. It sparked comment on the quality of the literature and on the role of the librarian in criticizing and evaluating the literature of his own field.

BOOK REVIEWING

It was pointed out that American historians manage to provide for themselves a fairly adequate amount of quality reviewing for a much larger body of literature. American historians do not outnumber American librarians. Writers of reviews should be drawn from the group who read and use reviews.

Why is the group of librarian-reviewers so sparse? There is no professional pressure to write reviews, to criticize and evaluate the record of professional research and opinion. Reviewing is fragmented among many journals. There is no coordination of reviews to give adequate coverage. Book review editors are part-time and unpaid or ill-paid. Reviews that are obtained seem to be, generally, of low quality. Few reviewers take the job seriously (the exception being the library school student recruited by a review editor on the faculty). Reviewers are "nice guys." They more often produce, aside from praise, unsatisfactory "document substitutes." Reviews are not primarily a means of bibliographic control. They do not serve the function of current awareness which should be the province of some other service organized for that purpose. The purpose of reviewing is evaluation. It is not the class of library school librarian ("librarian as librarian") but the more inclusive class of librarian ("librarian as reader") who should be the users, and the writers, of reviews. Even if just one journal's book reviewing section were expanded and improved (Library Journal, for instance), the quality of reviewing for the library profession would be improved greatly.

THE LITERATURE AND ITS USERS

Who are the users, and how quickly do they need the evaluation and criticism provided by reviewing services? How extensive is the field to be reviewed? Offhand, some groups at least can be identified: the scholar and researcher,

The usefulness of an annual review was debated. Some felt that annual review articles were useful to the specialist in that field, but not to students or the "uninitiated." One needs a considerable background to read an annual review article profitably. Others disagreed and felt that the very purpose of a review article was to inform the individual--whether specialist, generalist or student--of the recent developments in areas related (but not necessarily central) to his primary interest. There was, however, a general feeling that the review article had little meaning for the non-specialist unless he had direct access to the materials cited. [As an example, one participant described the frutiful experience of a group of library school students who had access to the Information Science Literature Display which contained hard copy of all the materials cited in Volume II of Cuadra's Annual Review of Information Science and Technology.] It was suggested that a microfiche collection should be provided as a part of the annual review package.

Many feel that the field is sadly lacking in state-of-the-art publications. Our current indexing services (such as Library Literature) tend to "level everything off." The needs of the conscientious practioner, and especially of the student in a graduate library school program, require an evaluative service that signals the primary authorities and provides a continuing state-of-the-art point of view.

CURRENT AWARENESS

Does, or does not, the field need rapid information? There seemed to be two generally acknowledged ideas of "current awareness" advocated. The first idea concentrated on the need for rapid signalling of fugitive and allied materials for the library school acquisitions librarian and the researcher (although some felt that the researcher generally maintains his own informal awareness network through contact with his fellow specialists). For other groups, would the annual review time-lag present a serious problem? Some felt it would for the teacher whose continuing needs to "keep up" were broader than his specialized research interests and for the library administrator whose decision-making should be supported by knowledge of current successes and failures that are relevant to his practical problems.

The other idea of "current awareness" concentrated on the needs of "those people who do not even know that they don't know." This idea envisioned a service that would range thinly over a very large area to provide "guides through the jungle of ignorance." It's central purpose would be to signal the literature that would play a role in bringing about change in the practical library situation.

COMPLEXITY OF THE PROBLEM

At the end of the session, the summarizer pointed out that the problem of bibliographic organization for the user of the literature is the problem of "how little to read." The identification of user groups and their needs requires an understanding of the social structure of the profession. At the center we have an "in-group" which is kept up to date by an informal communication structure. Ranged about the center are those who want to break into the in-group--a problem of social mobility. What are the information patterns of this second group, and what are their demands upon the literature? Ranging out in concentric circles are other groups, including the undefined "general practitioner" and, at the circumference, the student. What are their patterns and needs? These are complex questions with allusive answers. For instance, how do you provide for the user who is interested in "junk"--the literature of generally acknowledged low value--because he is interested in finding out where someone "went off the sled"? One can envision a very complicated and sophisticated system of abstracting, indexing, and awareness services, which would require extensive study to design. But one can also see the very real possibility of immediate improvement if we can get the existing services together and bring about some coordination, integration, and refinement. We aren't really going barefoot (as the shoemaker's children). We are probably in better shape then some of the other disciplines. We have a good foundation.

B. Second Session (April 19, 1:00 PM)

The moderator and reactors, aside from their direct comments on the papers (see Part I above), summarized the issues from the morning session and pointed the attention of the participants toward the problems of the ways in which we can provide those services already recommended in the papers and discussion.

It was pointed out that the primary functions of the ERIC Clearinghouse are to acquire the fugitive literature--the literature which is not well controlled bibliographically--to index and abstract it, and to repackage or to provide a certain amount of information and analysis. The Clearinghouse is seen as occupying a place between the researcher and the practitioner, so that the results of research are analyzed and made available to a wide audience. Should the ERIC Clearinghouse handle this job alone? Or should we rely on the library schools and be ultimately dependent on a cooperative arrangement, with all the problems involved therein? If we assign the responsibility to a single agency, or group of agencies, we must come to an agreement on (and be willing to live with) the criteria and the decisions made by such an agency. For instance, just what kind of "current awareness" service should result? We are not in agreement here on that question.

We have to remember that most of us here are from library schools, and we tend to emphasize the needs of faculty and students. But we have begun to talk this morning about the practitioner and his needs. We have different audiences who

have different demands on the same body of literature in terms of separate interests, of depth, of coverage of foreign literature, and in terms of urgency. For instance, the membership of the different professional associations, and their divisions, may well constitute distinct audiences. We must take account of this, and perhaps we should disseminate our bibliographical record and information services through the professional associations. For example, it would make sense to use some of the journals of the ALA for the dissemination of abstracts or bibliographies prepared by the ERIC Clearinghouse.

The point was made that, although the title of the conference referred to the control of "library science" literature, the papers and discussion thus far had assumed a wider scope, including the literature of documentation, information science and other related areas.

THE TASK

The task before us is to try to 1) define the field more accurately, 2) define the user groups and their needs, 3) define the size and form of coverage, and then finally 4) recommend the services that will give us that coverage. Then the question is, do we build on the existing apparatus or do we start from scratch? Do we coordinate and integrate, or do we centralize and create anew? After that the question is one of methodology. It is going to take a great deal of organization and human talent to pull this off--much the way the library community has mobilized itself in the past for some important undertaking.

The computer could play an important role, because of the value of machine-readable information and the many by-products that can be derived from it in time. Photography, as well, could be important, to provide the means for getting at the data in its original form. If our universe of information is small enough, couldn't we provide a microfiche collection of the materials which are cited in our comprehensive record?

A number of people commented on the following theme: that the services that we now enjoy, by the very highest standards and ideals of our own profession, are insufficient, though they have done very well within their own limitations in the past. Proportionately speeking, our own control of our own literature is not as good as it was in the past. Library Literature, for example, served our earlier library school programs much better than it serves our much more advanced programs today. In our own field we seem to apply different canons from those we apply in all other fields. Don't we, for example, have a kind of "Farmington Plan" responsibility in our own field? We may be making a serious omission in not covering Russian, Chinese and other sources of information. Cooperative work should be possible here. The same applies to our responsibility for controlling our own report literature.

CLASSIFICATION

A discussion was started on the relative merits of classification--whether traditionally based on the "logic of classes" or based on relational principles ("propositional logic"). The question was whether or not the needs of research in our field required approaches that could deal with more complex situations. The moderator expanded the question to: "How far in this field do you feel that we need a structure of classes to organize the kind of terminology and language that we will be concerned with in these bibliographical control services, and how far can we rely on natural language systems?" The discussion on this point was cut short by a plea to return to some other unfinished topics, but the moderator's question was taken up again at the end of the session.

CURRENT AWARENESS AGAIN

There followed more discussion on the definition of the field and the extent of the literature in question. There was a plea for breadth of coverage. Librarians, today in particular, perhaps more than any other time in our history, have to take all knowledge, wherever it may be, from whatever field, if it contributes to good library service. The practitioner, especially the administrator, needs a current awareness service whether he knows it or not. The participant in an SDI service with a wide data-base is exposed to relevant information from sources that normally would never cross his desk--information from host journals far outside his own field

and from other normally "fugitive" sources. Even when we broaden library science to include documentation and information science, our definition of the field is too narrow for full current awareness. In addition, a wide-ranging current awareness service could identify things which should be considered for inclusion in other indexing services or for state-of-the-art reviews.

Every scholar and practitioner might need such an awareness service, but not many would accept it. Such a service would provide more information than he could handle (when he can't even handle what does come across his desk now). What it comes down to is: is it better not to know and don't know you don't know, or is it better not to know and know you don't know? The real test is the economic one: everyone says they want these services, but individuals probably won't pay for them. Employers may, for their staffs. Professional associations may, for their membership. But it could be expensive, for no current awareness service which relies on human indexing could ever be current. We must have some kind of automatic indexing and accept the limitations of automatic indexing as they exist today. [The moderator asked for ideas on how librarians could be induced to make use of awareness services. One response was that the people who should use the services should be involved in their creation and maintenance]

Some felt that it was rather doubtful whether the different kinds of services suggested could be produced by voluntary or semi-voluntary cooperation. Success with express information services is best observed in the socialist block where a full-time, nationally organized production unit produces the service--as in Russia or Hungary. You can't run a service on a volunteer basis. Frederick Poole went over that road, and it didn't work--and it's going to work even less today.

RESEARCH AND COMMON SENSE

Why keep creating new agencies? Why weren't Federal monies given to the Wilson Company (instead of ERIC, for instance) to expand what we've got instead of creating a new agency? We spend too much time trying to define "needs." Users can't tell us what their needs are. We can't tell ourselves what our needs are. We could spend a lot of time in "research" trying to measure these things and then lose the advantage we could gain by going ahead now using our common sense. User-need studies never amount "to a hill of beans."

This latter point of view was attacked by some. We should trust our intuition, but if we find out it's wrong, we should want to change. It's finding out what we're doing wrong that should concern us. We should build into the planning and design of our services the capability for evaluating negative results and for bringing about change. Our old way of doing things, as exemplified by the Wilson Company's practices, is too fixed, not flexible enough to respond easily

to a demonstrated need for change. A more highly mechanized system, for instance, might be more flexible for adjusting the arrangement and other display features of a service in response to negative results, or for augmenting or re-shaping the data-base. Research has its place. Librarians have been flying by the seat of their pants for too long.

Information science is supposed to be the area that is going to help people control their own literature. Various institutions are experimenting on their own, and counting on the flesibility of manipulating material in machinable form. But a very great deal of money is being thrown away on these projects because the original studies haven't been thorough enough to provide the means to a desirable end. It would seem that one of the most profitable investments that could conceivably be made of government of other funds would be to control the literature of library and information science sufficiently to make possible the thorough study of this problem. It would be desirable to encourage and support the Wilson Company in applying new technology productively to what they are doing. There is something wrong with our sense of values when we're spending something on the order of three million dollars to investigate automation activities in libraries and we haven't got control of our own basic literature on the most rudimentary level. And here we are talking about sophisticated SDI services. It is not that the improvement of, say, Library Literature and Library Science Abstracts would alter the need for a current awareness

This approach is often manifested in classification schemes, and we know what most of these look like. But when we think of them in our mind's eye we think of notations, because we think of the appearance of those schemes on the page. This is a danger. It is possible to organize a body of material in a systematic way that is in fact a classified way, and never use anything that looks like a notation. A properly organized natural language system becomes a classified, systematic way of organizing things, if it is structured in that way. It is a matter of internal structure.]

THE TASK REDEFINED

The moderator summed up the discussion. The discussion so far had provided, despite disagreement on detail, an agreement on the need for a range of services based on what exists now but extending toward the ideals that we as professionals in our own field can see as essential. This agreement coincides with the proposals in Corrigan's paper, where he suggests that what is needed is (not necessarily in priority order) a rapid and wide-ranging current awareness service, a comprehensive indexing service that seems to be of the greatest priority (perhaps because it could be so easily built out of what we already have), and a less frequent but more detailed and deep abstracting service with a wider coverage.

The manner in which these are to be organized--the internal structure of these services, the intellectual and administrative structure that must stand behind them--is difficult to characterize at this time. It does seem, from the discussion, that we will need on one end--the current awareness end--the quick and earthy approach of the machine that will use something nearer a natural language approach then any of the other services. At the other extreme--at the level of the abstracting service--we would require a much more highly sophisticated classified approach to enable the user at his leisure to define more precisely the possible limits of his need to know.

Perhaps a detailed discussion of the manner in which these services are to be organized is a bit premature. A more pressing problem which we will have to discuss is: from where do the money and leadership come to implement the kind of things we are proposing here?

C. Third Session (April 19, 3:30 PM)

The Third Session opened the discussion to the full Conference, with the opportunity for pursuing issues already raised or introducing new topics for consideration. One point that was made at the outset was that it was not the H. W. Wilson Company but The H. W. Wilson Foundation that had provided a grant for financial support of the Conference. However representatives of the Wilson Company and the staff of Library Literature--along with the representatives of Library Science Abstracts, the ERIC Clearinghouse, and Documentation Abstracts--were participating and were very interested in the proceedings. They were there to listen, to find out what was needed, and to cooperate to the best of their ability in implementing the recommendations of the Conference.

FUGITIVE MATERIALS

Earlier in the day it had been announced that the ACRL Publications Committee had adopted a recommendation that the ACRL Microcard Series be expanded to include other kinds of fugitive materials (such as annual reports of libraries) in addition to the selected master's theses that presently constitute the bulk of the items in the Series. In response to a question from the floor, a member of the Publications Committee responded

that it was his assumption that the series would attempt to include not only current coverage of annual reports but also some kind of retrospective coverage. This policy change, by the way, would raise certain questions of duplication--or coordination--of the ACRL efforts and the ERIC Clearinghouse activities in the area of fugitive materials.

STUDYING USER NEEDS

A plea from the floor to continue the discussion on defining user needs elicited the response that study in this area should follow the practice of the American Psychological Association's studies. The APA first concentrated on the needs of the authors who produce the literature; next, the people who attended conferences and were interested enough in the current literature to come to meetings and to compare what they have learned there to what they have learned from the papers in the field; then, the other groups that apparently were not right in the forefront of current developments.

Another type of guideline for study might be found in the existing ALA structure, with its type-of-activity and type-of-library divisions. This might provide a more comprehensive analysis of types of users and kinds of need. It is very important for us to be equally aware of the needs of the school librarian, the librarian in the small public library, the small college librarian, and so on. The ERIC Clearinghouse is aware of this problem and will attempt to coordinate its

services with existing activities in the field. Should ERIC, for instance, produce a comprehensive extension list or should there be a classified extension list with various segments of it available to various segments of the community?

A strong plea was made in favor of conducting such studies internationally--or at least within the English-language bloc--rather then restricting them to the United States. The profession is not too large to do this. And the concerns of the various groups--whether library school faculty or public librarians or school librarians--are concerns that cross national lines. We should also study the information profile, not just the user profile, of library and information science--what is published for whom, by whom, and so on. This has never been done in a systematic way. And this would be one study that would have to be international in scope.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR DEVELOPMENT

One question posed the problem of where the responsibility for leadership would lie after this Conference was over. There was some feeling that, as the pressure on the field for improvement of library service increased, this would increase pressure from the field for more adequate bibliographic and library services for librarians. As it stands now, the information scientists and other scholars, and the needs of the library schools, are generating the pressure. Leadership will come from

those most concerned. ALA itself will only be moved to action by pressure from the field. Perhaps we will end up with something analogous to the system provided for the field of astronautics where the responsibility for bibliographic services is divided between a private association and a government-funded agency. Maybe that's the way that, say, ERIC and the Wilson Company (since the profession seems to have largely delegated its responsibility to Wilson) will eventually co-ordinate their activities. Our professional association, in the U.S. at least, does not seem to have recognized its responsibility to do its part in controlling our own literature.

COMPREHENSIVE COVERAGE

A question was raised about the coverage of audio-visual materials. To what extent are these controlled, or how successfully could they be integrated into the coverage of the existing services? How can library school librarians find out about them? Library Literature includes those that come to its attention. We must remember to include these materials in our planning for bibliographic services. It is significant that we should have to remind ourselves of this kind of thing; because it means that, although we go around exhorting everybody else not to forget the various kinds of materials besides the book, we don't practice what we preach. It is another example of that same kind of professional schizophrenia that we discussed this morning.

The problem of controlling and acquiring research reports was discussed. Does ERIC have to include the reports collected, indexed and disseminated by the Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information? Many criticized the CFSTI's Government-Wide Index as difficult to use (especially for retrospective searches) and felt that the profession's own services should cover all report literature relevant to the field (but should include CFSTI report numbers if materials are available from that source). If we are not careful we are going to be in the situation where access to our material is splintered by form and indexed by indexes which cannot be used retrospectively and are very difficult to use for current awareness purposes. Library Literature, as the comprehensive record service, should feed on other services and record all materials regardless of form. We might use something else for fast access service, but we should turn to Library Literature for the retrospective service that is comprehensive for all materials.

On another question of comprehensiveness vs. duplication, the suggestion was made that Library Science Abstracts provide coverage for foreign language materials and Library Literature be confined to material in English. Other participants objected to this idea. We are, or should be, a truly international discipline. We do not, within this country or within the English-speaking world, represent all library wisdom. It would be doing a great disservice to our profession--we would be a

profession that operated only at a parochial level--if we disregarded what was going on in other countries. Our comprehensive record should be internationally comprehensive.

COOPERATION AGAIN

There was general agreement on this latter point of view, but it brought up a corollary problem. Library Literature can index all these materials; but, if we can't get hold of them to look at them, what practical good will it do to index them? We need a back-up service. Chemical Abstracts helps you find the journals they cite. Their list of journals they scan also lists the holdings of the major libraries in the country. They also keep a supply in Columbus where you can get hold of the things they cover. We don't have such a service. The library school librarians should be encouraged to form cooperative acquisitions and interlibrary loan agreements. A union list of serial holdings would be useful. At Indiana University they keypunched their holdings of serials indexed by Library Literature. This could be expanded in scope and the holdings of other library science collections added to it.

D. Small Group Sessions (April 20, 9:00 AM)

From this point on it is difficult to summarize the discussion. Much of it was informal. The papers had been distributed before the Conference. They had been commented on during the first full day's sessions and had influenced much of the formal discussion. In the course of the first day, and the evening before, the participants had come to know each other informally. By the second evening informal discussion of the issues was rife and, as it turned out, very fruitful. The formal high point of the Conference came during the small group work sessions the next morning, which were not recorded. Each group reported the results of its discussion, in the form of recommendations, to the final full session of the Conference. The reports of the six work groups, and the discussion at the final session, were the basis for the final Summary of Recommendations issued by the Conference Editorial Committee.

E. Final Session (April 20, 1:00 PM)

The first half of the session was taken up with oral reports on the small group recommendations. During the course of the session most of the reports were also duplicated and distributed in hastily written form. The substance of these reports is contained in the published Summary of Recommendations and will not be reprinted here. The important discussion in this session concentrated on clarifying any apparent contradictions among the various group reports and also introduced some new topics or expanded on some topics previously introduced.

LIBRARY SCHOOL LIBRARIANS

One group, made up largely of library school librarians, took pains to read into the record a feeling shared by many of the participants. They urged that there be a continuing and progressive program to identify library school librarians and to provide a time and place for them to meet and communicate with one another. That morning the library school librarians had wanted very much to discuss their own collections and their own problems among themselves, but there wasn't time for that. In these two days they had begun to realize a sense of union and cooperation among themselves, and they were concerned that such feelings be continued and strengthened.

or of ways to develop new ones (such as the reviewing journal), while we wait for an independent and international study group to decide what the whole system ought to be. And ALA, for instance, can play any number of important roles in bringing about these improvements; but ALA is not a study group, and it is not good for studying; it is not a research group, and it is not good for research. We should encourage the ISG, and we should also ask the Office of Education to issue requests for proposals in this area. We need not worry about a little duplication of thought on something that we are all so concerned about.

RESOLUTIONS

The debate on the ISG and the question of continuing leadership resulted in two general resolutions which were passed unanimously by the Conference. They reflect the concern of the participants that there be some continuing influence exerted by the Conference in support of its recommendations, that the recommendations for more immediate action be pursued actively, and that a more extensive research effort be initiated.

> Resolution: That a [editorial] committee, made up of the Conference co-ordinator, the moderator, the work group discussion leaders, and the members of the original Planning Committee, be directed to draw up and disseminate the final form of the Conference recommendations and to see that the various recommendations are transmitted to appropriate agencies and organizations for action.

Resolution: That this Conference endorse immediately the establishment of the international study group which has been proposed by Group B.

During the debate on these resolutions, the make-up of the ISG was clarified. Some participants had volunteered to form a working party that would work toward the establishment of an international study group on information patterns. The working party was not the study group, which would have to be a more carefully planned, international group representative of a range of research capabilities. The working party is an ad hoc group, open to volunteers interested in furthering this project.

The Conference Editorial Committee prepared a final draft of the Summary of Recommendations which was released on April 26, 1968. [Reprinted in: ALA. Library Education Division. Newsletter, no. 65 (May, 1968), pp. 21-25] Members of the Editorial Committee and the Working Party also met in Kansas City on June 26, 1968, to review developments and plan further follow-up activities.

Respectfully submitted,

David L. Mitchell, Chairman
Conference Planning Committee

July 26, 1968

University Library, B98
State University of New York at Albany
1400 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12203

CONFERENCE ON THE BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL
OF LIBRARY SCIENCE LITERATURE

State University of New York at Albany
April 19-20, 1968

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS: CONTENTS

		PAGE
1.	Recommended Courses of Action	1
2.	Improvement of Existing Indexing Services	1
	A. Library Literature	1
	B. Coordination of Services	2
	C. Voluntary Deposit of Publications	2
3.	Improvement of Existing Library Services	2
	A. Cooperative Arrangements	2
	B. Historical Sources	2
	C. Organization of Library School Librarians	3
4.	New Ventures Urgently Needed	3
	A. Reviewing Journal	3
	B. Annual Review	3
	C. Announcement List	4
	D. National Center for Research Libraries in Library and Information Science	5
5.	Research and Development.	5
	A. International Study Group	5
	B. Federal Research Support	6
6.	Leadership	6
	A. Working Party	6
	B. Conference Editorial Committee	7
	C. Invitation	8

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The Conference on the Bibliographic Control of Library Science Literature, meeting at the State University of New York at Albany, April 19-20, 1968, has supported the following recommendations and proposals developed and debated by the conference:

1. Recommended Courses of Action

   The improvement of existing indexing and library services, the establishment of urgently needed new ventures, and the long-range study of what should constitute the best arrangements for effective bibliographic control in our field, should all proceed simultaneously.

2. Improvement of Existing Indexing Services

   A. Library Literature

      In view of the fact that it is the permanent comprehensive bibliographic base for our profession, Library Literature should:

      1. be expanded and strengthened in both scope and comprehensiveness to include all significant contributions in the field of library and information science and all relevant materials in related fields.

      2. be fully international in coverage and include all forms of publication.

      3. be issued more frequently, monthly or bi-monthly.

      4. undertake continuous revision of subject headings, and publish a list of new headings in each issue.

      5. undertake and encourage research and experimentation to improve its indexing vocabulary, which should permit deeper indexing and should have a more effective syndetic apparatus.

      6. consider the advantages to the user of format changes, such as arranging the current issue entirely by subject and date with a separate author index, or, while retaining the present dictionary arrangement, listing entries by title under each subject heading.

      7. establish subscription rates sufficient to support the expanded service recommended above.

B. Coordination of Services

The three established English-language indexing services--including Library Literature, Library Science Abstracts, and Documentation Abstracts, in cooperation with the new ERIC Clearinghouse for Library and Information Sciences--should come to a joint agreement upon the scope and policy of each service in order to assure adequate indexing of all kinds of materials and to guard against needless duplication.

C. Voluntary Deposit of Publications

It is the responsibility of all international, national and regional library associations and their component divisions to supply all their publications to the various bibliographic services. All other organizations, agencies, educational institutions and libraries that publish materials relevant to our field should share the same responsibility.

It is also desirable to establish depository agreements among such organizations and certain library school libraries in order to assure preservation and availability of copies of materials listed by the indexing services.

3. Improvement of Existing Library Services

A. Cooperative Arrangements

Library school libraries should develop cooperative arrangements to identify the special subject strengths of individual libraries and to promote agreements on the cooperative acquisition of foreign language, regional, and special subject materials.

B. Historical Sources

Library school librarians should gather significant primary source materials from their own regions (e.g., correspondence of librarians). The development of uniform procedures and entries could expedite the listing of these archival resources.

C. Organization of Library School Librarians

In order to develop cooperative programs, library school librarians should meet regularly to discuss and decide these matters. They should work to strengthen their formal organization currently being established within the Library Education Division of the American Library Association.

4. New Ventures Urgently Needed

A. Reviewing Journal

There should be established a major monthly reviewing journal, providing substantive critical reviews of important titles in library and information science and brief critical annotations of works in related areas. In the case of major controversial publications, more than one reviewer could be assigned to the same book. Opportunity for rebuttal could be offered in subsequent issues.

The journal should be distributed as a perquisite of ALA membership.

The lack of reviews for many important titles in library science and the needless repetition of others suggest that the editors of book review sections in current library science journals should consider the benefits which might result from the concentration of book reviewing talent in one place.

B. Annual Review

The establishment of a review of the year's work in librarianship, based on the selected, organized and evaluated literature of the field, is recommended. The review should consist of articles comparable to the LRTS annual review, but expanded and perhaps more substantial. Each division of ALA should take responsibility for seeing that the articles are prepared to cover their respective areas of responsibility. Publication of a single annual volume is recommended, with the possibility that the separate articles also be published in the journals of the respective divisions.

A pattern of coverage should be designed to provide flexibility. The several areas of librarianship vary as to the pace of significant change and as to the amount of publication. A cyclical pattern over a period of years, such as that of the Review of Educational Research or the Annual Review of Psychology, might be appropriate.

C. Announcement List

A fast announcement service for the purpose of library school acquisitions should be instituted. This service should exclude trade monographs and those periodicals indexed in Library Literature and Library Science Abstracts or included in the Winckler or Drexel lists. This service should include: new periodical titles beginning January, 1968; research reports in librarianship and related fields; foreign publications; offprints and reprints available in multiple copies; promotional materials useful for teaching purposes; library publications and other materials generated by or for libraries, i.e., surveys, directories, statistical reports, handbooks, staff newsletters, procedure manuals, annual reports, and library histories. Bibliographic description should include price, publisher's address and report numbers.

To achieve this service on an experimental basis, library school librarians should establish a cooperative designed to minimize duplication of effort. They could forward to a coordinator the above types of materials, or bibliographic description of such materials, from their region. (As an immediate practical step in this direction, Anne McFarland has volunteered to include in the Case Western Reserve library school acquisitions list any information about hard to obtain or little known items that is submitted to her by other library school librarians.)

Such announcement services would be facilitated if the ERIC Clearinghouse would publish frequent acquisition lists.

D. National Center for Research Libraries in Library and Information Science

The American Library Association should explore the possibility of setting up a cooperative national center or network of regional centers to acquire current and retrospective library science material, especially foreign literature and fugitive domestic materials. In addition, the need for and possibility of providing a translation service should be explored.

The planning for this center or network should immediately involve the cooperation of ALA Headquarters Library, the Library of Congress, the ERIC Clearinghouse, the larger library school libraries and any other libraries that maintain major collections in this field. The library of the Library Association and any similar facilities connected with other national or international library organizations should be invited to participate.

5. Research and Development

A. International Study Group*

An international study group on information patterns is needed to investigate the problems in, and the potential services to, the general field of library and information science. To guide future progress this group should be drawn initially from the English language community.

The international study group's responsibilities would include the initiation of studies of users and information patterns at both primary and secondary levels of information provision and control. It would meet regularly, and it would have a small permanent secretariat.

The bibliographic services to be considered should be comprehensive of the whole field, ranging from current awareness services to reviews and state-of-the-art reports. The service likely to be of highest priority is a comprehensive record service that indexes all material in library and information science and documentation and all relevant material in other fields. Its coverage would be world wide and would

*The following resolution was approved by a unanimous vote of the conference participants, April 20, 1968: "That this conference endorse the establishment of an international study group as proposed by Group B."

include all forms of data, from monographs to digital material and informal sources of research in progress.

Among other services to be considered would be a current awareness service based on the same collection as the comprehensive record service. The prime characteristic of this service is fast access. Another service also based on the same material would be a selective abstracting service to evaluate data and provide document substitutes, particularly for foreign language material not easily available or not readily comprehensible. The comprehensive record and selective abstracting services would support other services, most importantly a regular review and a series of state-of-the-art reports.

Research in all the areas outlined is urgently needed to work toward a proper balance and provision of the services indicated. Funding must be adequate to avoid uncertain service and development. These matters would become the concern of the international study group.

B. Federal Research Support

The Division of Library Services and Facilities of the U. S. Office of Education should issue requests for proposals for an investigative program (or a series of investigations) on information exchange within the library profession and on channels of information from related areas. This should be concerned with the multiplicity of modes of communication, definitions of information needs (whether recognized or not), degree of user satisfaction, etc. The work of the American Psychological Association and the American Institute of Physics might be appropriate examples for study.

6. Leadership

A. Working Party

Work toward the establishment of an international study group on information patterns has already begun with this conference. The first steps have been taken by calling this present meeting of interested parties from the U. S., Canada, and the United Kingdom.

A working party has already been formed. The following persons have volunteered to work towards the establishment of an international study group:

Pauline Atherton	- University of Syracuse
C. David Batty	- University of Maryland
Joseph Becker	- EDUCOM
Philip Corrigan	- College of Librarianship, Wales
John Herling	- SUNY at Buffalo
Theodore Hines	- Columbia University
Gerald Lazorick	- SUNY at Buffalo
Ben-Ami Lipetz	- Documentation Abstracts
Anne McFarland	- Case Western Reserve University
David Mitchell	- SUNYA
Andrew Osborn	- University of Western Ontario
Wesley Simonton	- University of Minnesota
Jane Stevens	- H. W. Wilson Company
H. Allan Whatley	- Library Science Abstracts

Any other person interested in participating is invited to contact one of these, or any member of the conference editorial committee.

B. Conference Editorial Committee

An editorial committee has been selected by the conference and charged with the responsibility of:

1. drafting the summary of recommendations

2. disseminating and publicizing the results of the conference

3. transmitting certain of the conference recommendations directly to the organizations and agencies so named in the summary of recommendations

4. encouraging the support of other organizations and agencies, either by direct contact or through appropriate intermediaries.

Corrigan (cont'd)

Following from such a first recommendation, subsequent recommendations, although personal postulates and highly tentative, seek to remove the worst excesses of lack of coverage and inadequate integration. Three levels/types of service are suggested: 1) LSI: Library Science Information: a current awareness fortnightly service which covers about 400 information items per issue; the subject indication should be of the broad group or 'signalling' kind; the service would be non-cumulating and would be issued at a low price. 2) LL: Library Literature: the comprehensive record of information on, or relevant to, library science; a monthly index with specific subject arrangement cumulating annually and five-yearly; based on the existing LIBRARY LITERATURE but with input, arrangement and publication radically altered. 3) ILSA: International Library Science Abstracts: a selective abstracting service issued every two months concentrating on material worthy of permanent abstraction (i.e., creation of document substitutes) aiming at about 3000 abstracts per year, 50% being translation abstracts; classified arrangement; annual and five-yearly complete cumulations; based on the existing LIBRARY SCIENCE ABSTRACTS but produced by permanent staff at the Library Association Library (UK) with international financial support.

The tentative 'model' suggested is compared both with the existing pattern and with the suggestions of others. The paper concludes with suggested methods of financing.

There are 94 references. (PRDC)

Herling & Lazorick

A Proposal for a Current Awareness Service for the Literature of Library and Information Science, by John P. Herling, Associate Director of Libraries, SUNY at Buffalo;* and Gerald J. Lazorick, Director, Technical Information Dissemination Bureau, SUNY at Buffalo.

To meet the need for quick access to the literature, and to obtain more effective communication among librarians, information scientists, mass communication, specialists, operations analysts, and behavioral

*Presently, Director of Libraries, Cleveland State University

Herling & Lazorick (cont'd)

scientists, the authors propose a KWOC (Key-Word Out-of-Context) Index using existing machine-readable bibliographical data, such as supplied by the Institute of Scientific Information and Pandex, supplemented by in-house conversion of core journals and U.S. Government Research Reports. Some 340,000 items (annually) would be matched against a set of authors' names, journal titles, and index terms or groups of terms, the latter weighted to eliminate false drops. Preliminary computer output would be manually screened, then matched against an open vocabulary to provide the output in the form of a monthly printed bulletin arranged by subject, with an author index. (JPH)

Osborn — A Dual System for Indexing Library and Information Literature, by Andrew D. Osborn, Dean, School of Library and Information Science, The University of Western Ontario.

Threeoverall levels of bibliographic control are needed: one of them, as complete as possible, should be the aim of published indexing and abstracting services; the other, a selection of prime items organized and displayed for decision-making on the value of items, should be the aim of a complementary computer service.

Library Literature should fulfill the first function, but it must expand in coverage (especially of foreign literature and of earlier volumes of journals recently added) and must change its display techniques for ease of consultation. The arrangement of entries under subjects according to cataloging form should be discontinued; the substantive part of the entry, the title, should precede the catalog-style heading. Inverse chronological order should be used in extensive listings. The amount of detail in subject listings should be reconsidered (e.g., many sub-titles should not be deleted from subject listings). Indexing terminology is imprecise. This becomes even more critical in extensive listings. Semantic studies should be undertaken.

the teacher not actively engaged in research, the student, the administrator, the working librarian in a wide variety of work situations and at different career junctures. Would an annual review consisting of critical essays serve the needs of some of these groups? What are the uses of reviews? For the core literature the purpose of reviews should be evaluative and supplementary (e.g. the body of reviews on Cleverdon's Cranfield reports). For the literature of allied fields, signalling its existence and relevance is an important function. Awareness services for librarians should be extended to cover the things beyond those we can fairly easily get by talking to each other. Librarianship is a service discipline. Our literature must discuss the outside community that our profession serves. What happens "on the fringe" may be even more important to us than it would be to another conventionally structured discipline. For us, library science is the meat of the donut--but we must be continually aware of the hole in the donut that contains all the disciplines that library science transmits and the outer edge of the donut which is the sociology of knowledge or the context of demand. Our central concern for our own theory and practice must be supported by a concern for the development of knowledge and the ways in which knowledge is transmitted and used. These "peripheral concerns" as reflected in allied literature must be brought in some fashion to the attention of all groups of librarian-users.

The discussion had broadened beyond "book reviewing" to the function of awareness and indexing services. The current services, and Library Literature in particular, were criticized for being (1) not inclusive enough of core literature and (2) not sufficiently interdisciplinary in scope. Library Literature was anthropomorphized ("like my mother") and characterized as being very faithful but somewhat out of touch with the times. It was defended as being willing to change and cooperate with other services but uninformed as to the needs of the profession. One by-product of the present conference could be to supply that information.

ANNUAL REVIEWS

After coffee, the group returned to continue the discussion of reviewing and awareness, and at this point concentrated on the question of an annual review service. The difficulties of the chapter writer for an annual review were pointed out; that is, the difficulty of gathering references to relevant materials and the difficulty of obtaining copies of the relevant materials. Delay in producing annual reviews is inevitable--especially if there is no "feeder system" that already provides a current awareness service or a frequently published selective abstracting service during the year.

service. We should have SDI service, but before we get that we should first have an adequate retrospective listing. We should provide ourselves with at least an even break when we go to the library to make a search. We should as soon as possible, this year if possible, start reforming the existing services--get funds for them, get staff, get that organized--and then go on to think about new services.

VOLUNTARY COOPERATION: A DISTINCTION

The subject of voluntary cooperation in indexing and abstracting came up for discussion again. Two kinds of voluntary or cooperative effort were defined. The first involved the spontaneous, and usually unpaid, cooperation of an individual who provides indexing services with supplementary information about relevant materials encountered in out-of-the-way sources, or who cooperates with a national project that is trying to coordinate the compilation of, say, retrospective bibliographies of library history in the various states. The second kind of voluntary cooperation is more formal in nature and involves the cooperation of institutions--such as library schools--which accept the on-going responsibility to staff and support one part of a larger cooperative acquisitions and indexing project. Another example of the second kind of cooperation would be to enlist the publishers of primary journals in an effort to produce author-assisted abstracting, indexing or categorization to help the secondary services.

This last example was discussed and defended as a workable arrangement. But there was some doubt, based on past experience, as to its over-all effectiveness and efficiency. It was pointed out that the difficulty in cooperative indexing lies not in lack of intelligence on the part of the indexer but in lack of knowledge of the structure of the index and in lack of an appropriate working framework. This problem brought up the subject of classification again.

CLASSIFICATION AGAIN

Some felt that the use of a faceted scheme would help to solve the problem. Faceted classification was then criticized for being, despite appearances, merely an extension of the logic of classes. [One participant acknowledged that the future of indexing does lie with a classified approach, rather than the subject heading or other verbal approach, but not with any of the existing schemes, including the Classification Research Group's faceted classification for library science. There are some possibilities in UDC, which is a limited relational system; but what we need is a truly relational system.] The desirability of using a classification scheme from an international point-of-view was brought up, as was the difficulty of adequately displaying a faceted or a relational scheme in printed form. Finally natural language indexing was defended and related to classification. [One participant pointed out that classification does not necessarily imply classification scheme. It is simply a systematic approach.

ALA HEADQUARTERS LIBRARY

In connection with one of their recommendations, one group suggested that the ALA Headquarters Library publish check lists of its unique holdings (such as the deposit collections of ALA committee reports) and indicate their availability for inter-library loan or other research use.

HERLING AND LAZORICK PROPOSAL

One group went on record as favoring the proposal that a current awareness service be produced by the Technical Information Dissemination Bureau at the State University of New York at Buffalo. [This refers to the paper by John Herling and Gerald Lazorick]. This group felt that, although the proposal had not been discussed at any length during the Conference, the authors should be encouraged to seek funds for a trial run of the project.

INTERNATIONAL STUDY GROUP

The major topic for discussion was the proposal by one group that a international study group (ISG) be formed to investigate information patters in the field of library and information science. The intent of the group had been to form a working party, initially made up of some of the Conference participants, that would take the initiative in helping to form the ISG. The ISG would be a new group--not affiliated immediately with ALA, ASIS, FID, LA, etc.--and would continue to follow up the research suggestions recommended

by this Conference. There seemed to be some feeling that such a program would never get off the ground within the bureaucracies of the existing professional organizations.

Others disagreed. A representative of the ALA reminded the group that the ALA was a co-sponsor of the present conference and assured the participants that the ALA and its appropriate divisions would react as fully as they could to any recommendations directed to them. Others deplored the tendency to fragmentation. "Why go creat something else to die?" We might more effectively spend our time urging ALA to take the same kind of professional interest in information exchange among its members as the APA has done. Some of the recommendations are obviously aimed at ALA. The ALA journals, for example, have been duplicating each other in their reviews and omitting a fair amount that needs to be reviewed. If the ALA sponsored a consolidated reviewing journal along the lines of Contemporary Psychology it would be a significant step forward.

The debate on this issue proceeded for some time until an agreement was reached that it would be expedient to work through ALA and any professional or commercial organization that could be enlisted, and that it was also important to encourage an independent study group. There are two, three, or four levels of activity that ought to go on at once. We cannot stop thinking about improving the bibliographic tools we have now,

The members of the editorial committee are:

C. David Batty	- University of Maryland
Edwin Colburn	- The H. W. Wilson Foundation
J. Richard Heinzkill	- University of Oregon
Venable Lawson	- Emory University
David Mitchell	- SUNYA
Sarah Rebecca Reed	- University of Alberta
Jane Stevens	- H. W. Wilson Company
Marion Taylor	- ALA-Library Education Division
Frances Thackston	- University of Maryland
Ruth White	- American Library Association

C. Invitation

The problems of the bibliographic control of library and information literature are problems for the whole profession. Every individual librarian, library or library organization in the English-speaking world is urged to help solve these problems and is invited to contact any member of the working party, the conference editorial committee, or any of the agencies named in various recommendations. International organizations, such as Unesco and IFLA, and librarians and libraries from the non-English speaking world are also invited to cooperate in what should become a truly international effort.